DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 048 818 HE 002 009

TITLE	The Nature and Purposes of the University; A Discussion Memorandum. Interim Report.
INSTITUTION	Harvard Univ., Cambridge , Mass. Univ. Committee on Governance.
PUB DATE	Jan 71
NOTE	18p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Organization, *Decision Making, *Governance, *Higher Education, *Institutional Role, *Objectives
IDENTIFIERS	*Harvard University

ABSTRACT

This report on the nature and purposes of Harvard University presents: (1) a brief overview of the present governance crisis at Harvard; (2) a discussion of the traditional values and purposes of the University; and (3) the issues facing the University. These issues include: (1) the external aspects of corporate decisions, i.e., the question of the types of decisions that are proper and improper for the University to make as a corporate entity; (2) the problem of relative emphasis that should be given to the University's functions of education, research, preservation of culture, and direct service to community; (3) the choice of structure for scholarly endeavor; (4) University-wide educational policies; (5) the respective roles in governance of students, faculty, administrators, alumni, and governing boards; (6) the administration of justice; (7) financial issues; and (8) the degree to which the entire governance process is centralized or decentralized. (AF)

ED048818

THE Committee ON GOVERNANCE
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

The Nature and Purposes of the University
A Discussion Memorandum

INTERIM REPORT

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS
JANUARY 1971

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 002 007

This Report discusses questions related to the nature and purposes of Harvard. As one member of the Committee commented, to attempt to answer such questions at this point in history is "foolhardy but necessary." Accordingly, unlike some of the other Committee documents, this Report does not consist solely of issues and options, but sets forth views that emanated from short papers prepared for and discussions at numerous meetings of one of the Committee's working groups. The full Committee has authorized its publication for discussion and comment.

The Committee recognizes that answers to the questions raised in this Report, to the extent that they are answerable on anything but an individual basis, affect the Committee's work in other areas. For example, one's view of the purposes of the University will, of course, influence significantly the model of governance that one would recommend for the central administration of the University or the management and allocation of its resources. Nevertheless, because of time constraints, the Committee is releasing for discussion its other reports on substantive governance questions independently of the tentative views expressed herein. These views on the purposes of the University in turn may be modified by further discussions and conclusions on substantive questions.

The members of the working group preparing this interim report are as follows:

Henry W. Bragdon, representative from the Associated Harvard Alumni.
Archibald Cox, faculty representative from the Law School.
Paul D. Hanson, faculty representative from the Divinity School.
Charles W. Harris, faculty representative from the School of Design.
Keith B. MacAdam, student representative from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences.
Thomas B. MacKenzie,* former student representative from the Medical School.
Richard Miller, Secretary and Business School student.
James S. N. Preus,* former faculty representative from the Divinity School.
William G. Saltonstall,* former representative from the Associated Harvard Alumni.
Leslie D. Schlessinger, student representative from the Medical School.
Benjamin I. Schwartz, faculty representative from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences.
Kirby Wilcox,* former student representative from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences.
Paul R. Lawrence, *Chairman*, faculty representative from the Business School.

Comments on this Report are earnestly sought and should be sent to the Committee on Governance, Wadsworth House, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138.

JOHN T. DUNLOP.
Chairman

* Served on the working group during the 1969–1970 academic year.

ED048818

THE NATURE AND PURPOSES OF THE UNIVERSITY

A Discussion Memorandum

INTERIM REPORT

Overview of the University Crisis

In considering the present governance crisis at universities in general and at Harvard in particular, the members of the Committee have asked themselves this question – are the current problems a consequence of our institutional framework, our traditional policies, the persons who hold positions, or developments outside the university? We concluded that no one of these sources could be isolated as the cause and none could be exonerated. The world outside the university is quickly undergoing a set of significant changes which impinge upon the university and to which the university is having a profoundly difficult time adjusting.

The web of causation between external events and internal circumstances is too intricate to unravel in detail, but the major factors must be cited. An ugly, protracted, and widely unpopular war is not new to the world, but such a war in combination with nuclear capability, electronic communication, and draft-distorted college careers has created a level of moral anguish that is tragically unique. Pollution of our natural environment is not new, but in combination with population growth, relative material abundance, and our increased understanding of ecology it has generated a new order of expectations and discontents. Racism is not new, but our heightened awareness of the depth and pervasiveness of its blight has made its continuance intolerable.

We are all painfully aware of these problems and of many others we could readily add. Yet we sense that even if these contemporary sources of tension were to abate suddenly, other sources would still be at work. These world events have served to speed up the crystallization of a new set of priorities in the value systems of young Americans. By their actions as well as their words, they are moving their value emphasis from private well-being to

public well-being. They press for the extension of democratic processes in all areas of life. They are also raising fundamental questions concerning the meaning of life. These are dramatically new states of mind. In the light of our population increase, our technical and organizational sophistication, and our private material affluence, these shifts are not hard to understand, but they are extremely hard to accommodate within our traditional institutions. The generation gap is a reality as well as a cliche. And, given such a gap, it is to be expected that the university is the institution where the resulting tension is focused. Among all major institutions, the university is uniquely dependent for its very survival on maintaining the confidence and support of both the young and the old. As an institution it stands unavoidably in the midst of the most explosive issues of our times.

This fact has hit the governance apparatus of universities with sudden and comprehensive pressures. The intensity of these strains will ebb and flow with contemporary events, but there is no reason to expect that the basic shift in values will be reversed. It need not be a point of shame to confess that Harvard, along with other universities, has been caught ill-equipped to cope with these new realities. They have placed extreme pressure on our governance structures, on all University personnel, and on our traditional policies.

The Corporation finds itself overtaxed with newly perceived political and social implications of issues that formerly could be treated as fairly routine. The President's office is strained to the breaking point by a host of major long-term policy questions arising even while sudden bursts of on-campus tension sap time and energy. The traditional departmental structure is under pressure in the face of new needs that fail to respect traditional disciplinary boundaries. The financial policies of Harvard are under pressure from rising costs, from the threat of loss of customary support, from challenges to the legitimacy of receiving revenue from government, and from the urgency of undertaking new commitments. The decision-making mechanisms of the several Faculties have labored under the burden of issues that are unprecedented in volume and kind.

Thus the causes of the current crisis are multiple and interdependent. But they come together to challenge the traditions of Harvard as a set of distinctly new perceptions and expectations. It is futile to deny these facts or to rail against them if we would.

Fortunately, as President Lowell used to remark, Harvard's one fixed tradition is that of change. The proper starting place for change is a basic re-examination of the values and purposes of the University. What is its proper role in regard to the general society in which it is embedded? What are the issues with which a revised governance system must be designed to deal? What relations are desirable among its several constituencies, the faculty, administration, Governing Boards, and students, present and past? Such fundamental questions need to be addressed before the Committee's detailed recommendations on Harvard's governance are finally developed.

The Values and Purposes of the University

Traditionally, the pursuit of truth and learning is the central value of the university. This value unites the university's primary functional purpose of providing education with the supporting purposes of generating knowledge, serving the community, and preserving our cultural heritage. The justification of special academic freedom rests ultimately on its being a necessary condition for the pursuit of truth. But in many quarters today the ideal of an institution devoted to the search for truth by open inquiry has lost credibility. Why?

Has this ideal lost credibility within the university because too many university men have been diverted from the search for truth? To be blunt – the answer is yes. To put it more judiciously – we need to ask ourselves some difficult questions.

One such question is, have the ever-increasing demands of the buyers of our products caused faculties to abdicate their responsibility for determining the course of teaching and inquiry? Our modern industrial society has a voracious appetite for young people trained for professional, managerial, and technological careers. The demand generates pressure upon the academic community to turn out, and upon students to become, the "products" in greatest demand in the existing social order. The current runs so strongly in this direction that there is danger of neglecting the basic question: Education for what larger purposes? A legitimate part of the educational function is to accommodate the needs of many students to learn to play a constructive role within the current social structure, but often the search for

truth also requires both him and his teacher to question that same social structure. The function of the university community in educating the young for vocations useful to society must be kept in constant tension with its role in providing a forum for social and moral criticism.

The buyer's market extends to the provision of knowledge through research, reports, consultations, and, sometimes, active participation in the conduct of affairs. The demand generates countless indirect and subtle pressures affecting the conduct of the whole academic enterprise: course enrollments, research grants, consultation fees, public and professional kudos, promotions, and smaller perquisites. The government is the largest single buyer of knowledge, perhaps larger than all others combined; thus, its demands put its stamp upon the academic community. To the extent that the consumers of knowledge are indifferent to suffering or injustice, its providers help to perpetuate the wrong. This circumstance, probably more than any other, has eroded confidence in the plea that university men are impartial seekers of truth. Again, one must note a measure of ambivalence. The uses to which knowledge will be put cannot be known in advance, nor is the use always constant. The purposes of the buyers of knowledge are seldom as sharply right or wrong as those of the heroes and rogues of television. In some areas one may even cherish the hope that the provision of knowledge and understanding is the best way to change a mistaken government policy. But we must ask ourselves, to what extent do the purchasers of our products, rather than our own sense of where we should reach for truth, presently determine the direction of our corporate and individual endeavors?

This question is pressed more urgently because of current intellectual fashions. For instance, the idea that knowledge should lead to wisdom has been considered old-fashioned. Instead, the "positivist, technocratic" view of knowledge has insisted that all learning and intellectual effort must base itself on what it conceives to be the paradigm of the natural sciences. In this view the central role of the university is to advance the frontiers of knowledge through distinct, autonomous disciplines. The positivist technocrat insists upon separating the world of "fact" from the sphere of "value" and asserts a somewhat simple-minded and unproblematic notion of objectivity. This tendency to look to the systematization and perfection of disciplines has not been

confined to the social and natural sciences. In the humanities, in the law, in philosophy, there is so much sheer professional expertise as to make it natural enough to forget the sustaining ideal of the education of individual character and the slow persuasion of public conscience. But this tendency toward specialism, if unbridled, serves to split research efforts away from teaching and both teaching and research away from a concern with the large-scale issues of our times. It downgrades the importance of excellence in teaching with an over-emphasis on techniques and facts.

This argument is not meant to belittle the values of technology, the importance of internal coherence, or the need for every sort of knowledge. Still less is it intended to fly to the opposing pole of subjectivism, which discovers absolute truths by revelation – or pure intuition. The point is simply this: intellectual concerns that become divorced from the great moral issues, from the aspirations of humanity and goals of the enterprise are inadequate. University men deserve criticism if our inquiries and teaching are value-free, detached from the great issues such as racial justice, relief of poverty, pollution of the environment, and war and peace. A university should be not only an institution that preserves culture and advances the frontiers of knowledge; it should also be a place where the conflicting social, intellectual and spiritual tendencies of an age confront each other in the classroom on the common ground of respect for the relevance of sustained rational endeavor. Have we enmeshed ourselves in too narrow a conception of the scientific method?

To sharpen our question further, we can compare Harvard with two models that have been put forward to clarify the choice that exists concerning the relation between the university and its surrounding social order. The "classical" model would have the university stand outside, detached from society. Such a university would be peopled with scholars holding all varieties of creeds and beliefs who are set free to question and criticize all areas and aspects of human experience. The primary role is that of critic. The second type is the "pragmatic" model, in which the primary function is one of service to the needs of the contemporary social system. Such service centers around the education of large numbers of people, with additional contributions in the form of the generation and application of knowledge. The emphasis here is on direct involvement. Each model has its own price. If one

chooses the first, then one is barred in the role of teacher and researcher, though not as a citizen, from going beyond theory into active advocacy. If one chooses the second, one must acknowledge the right of outside groups to influence the nature of the services to be rendered.

Both of these types, while extreme, have their proponents at Harvard as well as at other universities. While Harvard has represented a mix of these two models, it seems that in recent years, it has drifted toward the pragmatic model. Perhaps the question is not which type is best but rather how to achieve a better balance and, beyond that, how to transcend the dilemma by enhancing the qualities of both detachment and involvement. After all, both tendencies can be seen in the behavior of the major campus groups. Students are not only drawn outward toward involvement with current social issues but also inward toward the detached acquisition of knowledge and learning. Faculty are pulled both outward toward the development of new knowledge and inward to reflection and the classroom. Administrators are involved outward in the search for resources and also inward in the coordination of academic affairs. In appropriate amounts, these dichotomies in interaction can generate the creative tension that can develop greatness in a university. A lack of balance can also destroy it.

In the last analysis all individual and institutional commitment to a search for truth through the process of reason has rested on faith – upon the belief that man is a rational and social being endowed with a sense of justice that enables him to choose between good and evil; that he must choose for himself; that there are circumstances that best facilitate that choice; and that we must do what we can to bring this to pass. This traditional faith is less easily defended now than fifty years ago. For one thing, we have learned that reasoning is a less simple process than was once supposed. We are more mindful of the darker, frightening side of man. On the brighter side, we are more ready to agree that spontaneity, intuition, love – all the life of feeling that we associate with the ways of the poet and the artist – may save the processes of the intellect from sterility and desiccation. The insight of the social sciences and the honesty of the arts have taught us to look at ourselves stripped of pretense and what we see is less than lovely. It takes honesty and courage to see ourselves as we are; but perhaps we should strive to regain the greater

Hellenic courage to see man stumble and fall, yet avow his nobler capacity. In the long run, mankind needs some institution dedicated to the search for truth and the value of intellectual inquiry. The university has undertaken the job, and although it may have been diverted, it has a greater potential for fulfilling the role than any other human institution. We must reaffirm our commitment to the search for truth as the central value of the university. We must rekindle our faith in the capacity of people to choose wisely for themselves within a climate of honest search. We must renew our dedication to a university community wherein the dialectic of detached inquiry and passionate involvement is safeguarded and preserved.

Issues Facing Harvard Governance

The process of clarifying the values and purposes of the University can contribute to the review of Harvard's present structure of governance. Beyond this, we need to examine some of the more salient issues facing the University to seek any implications they may hold for modifications of Harvard's governance.

External Aspects of Corporate Decisions

One of the more thorny issues facing Harvard is the question of the types of decisions that are proper and improper for the University to make as a corporate entity. The University as a corporate whole or through its formally designated parts presently makes many decisions that carry important political and social consequences beyond the confines of the University. The number and scope of such decisions can be extended if it is deemed desirable. It is useful to distinguish three types of such actual and potential decisions.

The first category involves those unavoidable corporate decisions with collateral and unintended public consequences. For example, a decision to acquire land and clear it for University expansion carries the collateral consequence of displacing its present users. In times past when land was less intensely used these collateral consequences could largely be ignored. This is no longer true. Collateral consequences also flow from investment decisions and employment decisions, to name two other examples. The fact that important collateral consequences exist makes it impos-

sible, even if desirable, for the University to be truly neutral about all political issues. Therefore, the governance procedures of the University must provide for the deliberate consideration of the political and social as well as other consequences of decisions of this type.

The University makes another class of decisions in which the impact on society is one of the principal intended consequences. Actively seeking an increase in the enrollment of minority students is an example of this type of decision. Another might be the decision to sponsor the Center for Population Studies. All decisions having to do with allocating the University's limited resources of money and people to the many claims for support that are at least partially justified by their relevance to the problems of our times have such consequences although they are often less obvious. Governance procedures must provide some mechanisms for the deliberate consideration of the societal consequences of these decisions as well as the many other factors involved. In fact, we see great merit in focusing effort on the improvement of decision-making procedures for such issues. Universities are slow to respond in their research and teaching programs to newly emerging societal issues to the resolution of which they can properly contribute – and Harvard is no exception. Better procedures for weighing these always difficult decisions in a timely and open manner are much to be desired.

Finally, the University as a corporate body can, if it so chooses, adopt explicit positions on general political and societal issues beyond the decisions of the two types cited above. For example, the University could resolve and proclaim a position it would advocate on general issues such as taxation, pollution, the Middle East conflict, and so forth. In our view, the case for avoiding corporate acts of this type is overwhelming. If scholars insist upon committing the prestige of any university to one side or the other of a political battle, other forces equally entitled to enter the arena will seek to commit the University's prestige to the other side. Their power may be equal or greater, if not their merit. Furthermore, an institutional political commitment, especially when carried into active support, imposes an orthodoxy upon individual members of the university community which is prejudicial to the open-minded search for truth. Finally, the adoption of official institutional positions diverts the scholar from his principal function. "Politicking" for petty ends is common

enough among academics, and factions are not unknown in many schools and departments. Both would multiply if advocacy of a social or political issue in a departmental, faculty, or university vote became a "scholarly" function. Indeed, appointments might be made on a frankly political basis rather than by a detached judgement of scholarship and teaching capacity. One important exception arises whenever the role of the university itself becomes a political issue – then it must be free to take a corporate position.

It will not be easy to maintain and communicate the distinction between the weighing of the political implications of appropriate corporate decisions of types one and two, and acts of corporate political leadership of type three. There will be misunderstandings. But to hold with the utmost tenacity to this distinction is essential. To deny the reality of type one is hypocrisy, to avoid type two is socially irresponsible, while to engage in type three is to abandon one of the central virtues of the university. Only by maintaining these distinctions can Harvard sustain a balance of detached involvement.

Priorities and Linkage Among University Functions

A second issue facing Harvard's governance is the perpetual problem of the relative emphasis that should be given to the university functions of education, research, preservation of culture, and direct service to the wider community. Most, if not all, university people would probably agree that education is the last of these four functions that conceivably could be dispensed with. Harvard was founded with a primary focus on "the education of youth" and on "the advancement of all good literature, arts, and sciences." Research as we know it today came much later, but has evolved into a major function of the University. Harvard has tended to be relatively cautious and limited in its commitment to direct service in terms of field projects, action research, etc. and this is now being questioned. The University's critics have dwelt at length on this problem, but their counsel appears inconsistent. On the one hand, they urge the University to cut back its involvement with anything that smacks of contract research or training for established institutions, while on the other hand they reserve their sharpest assaults on the University for its restraint in becoming directly involved in broad societal issues. But perhaps this inconsistency can be dealt with if we make an important distinction. For example, issues such as war and peace,

poverty, race, pollution, population and illness are large-scale and long-term problems that, however defined, are central to the persistence and advancement of our civilized life, not to be confused with shorter-term issues, such as guidance systems, and postal reform.

To pursue this distinction further, Harvard needs, in our view, to consider seriously whether or not to engage more directly in teaching and research concerned with a few such large-scale problems. Any analysis of such problems must draw on a wide variety of disciplines and fields of knowledge. Such "interdisciplinary" enterprises have in the past not enjoyed a high reputation. Too many have been ill-considered, ineffectual, and without a clear conception of purpose. Future efforts to deal with problems of man across the boundaries of the present disciplines should be based on far deeper thought, a much clearer focus, and a stronger shared commitment by the relevant faculties than has been characteristic. If such were possible, however, we would argue that such developments could have a profound effect on the well-being of the University. Instead of dissipating its resources among a hodge-podge of lesser services initiated by outsiders, the University, through a process of individual and collective choice, would focus attention on a carefully selected set of long-term problems. They could be a unifying force that would pull teaching, research, and service, as well as students and faculty, into closer linkage.

Choice of Structure

The issue raised above brings up the choice of the structure for scholarly endeavor. Harvard is similar to other American universities in organizing most of its faculties by departmental subject matter. This arrangement is now being questioned in many quarters and it raises a special kind of governance issue. Too frequently critics of the departmental structure have ignored its strengths and posed the alternatives on an either/or basis. The departmental structure has consistently served to strengthen the quality of academic research, and it has helped maintain at least a specialized form of linkage between teaching and research. But its emphasis on specialism has downgraded the importance of general education and has impeded work on interdisciplinary problems. There are already emerging at Harvard a number of new centers of work that cut across disciplinary lines. Perhaps

such new structures can be considered for development as complements to the existing departments. Such centers of work could not only focus around topics such as the large-scale problems discussed above, but also around the extension of the teaching of liberal arts to undergraduates under the auspices of the Houses.

University-Wide Educational Policies

An additional issue arising for University governance involves the relation between undergraduate, graduate, and professional education. This raises a host of important questions. Should the undergraduate program be reduced in length? Should work experience be required before proceeding to graduate or professional training? Or should work experience be organized for students even during the undergraduate years? Should professional schools give more attention to the larger purposes of their callings, even as "arts and sciences" give more attention to the applications of their knowledge? Should Harvard offer more joint professional degrees in response to student interests in cross-cutting careers?

There are other issues that might be considered to be University-wide in character. Does the role of women in the various schools as students, faculty and staff need to be reviewed throughout the University? Is Harvard's response to the special needs of Black and other minority groups appropriate? These and other educational policy issues are arising, and beyond the Council of Deans there exists no active University-wide forum for their careful consideration.

Governing Roles for University Groups

As an additional major issue confronting Harvard and other universities, we cite that of the respective roles in governance of students, faculty, administrators, alumni, and governing boards. The central thrust underlying the current questioning of the traditional roles of the various university groups seems to be a search for community. This reflects a wide concern in the intellectual world as a whole with the revival of the "community" as a central value in a society dominated by vast, atomizing, impersonal structures. We find much merit in this desire to bridge the differences of role, age, sex, culture, race, religion, and class. We would emphasize again that the shared commitment of all par-

ticipants in university life to truth seeking is the essential foundation for the desired sense of community. It is also true that the university community is constituted of differentiated groups of people who are, to varying degrees, dependent upon each other. As in any institution, these differentiated groups come into being and exist for the well-being and effective functioning of the others. All are truly essential – none can be dispensed with, if the university as a community is to thrive. Each of these groups can serve the others effectively to the extent that their differences are respected, for these differences constitute their special competences and contributions. Hence the building and maintenance of the university community rests upon the capacity to take fullest account of the differences in talent, interest, experience, and roles of the constituent membership. The problem of university governance is to find and develop the means to facilitate the unique contributions of these groups.

We are currently faced with the passionate concern of many students with equality as a central social value and a tendency to question all authority on the ground that all authority has been found wanting in meeting the ills of mankind. Since the university as an institution is made up of constituencies with differing tasks and responsibilities, there are inevitably differential distributions of authority and responsibility, however far one may wish to push the principle of equality. The relationship between teacher and student, which is a keystone of the whole structure, bears within itself certain irreducible elements of authority and hierarchy, however much one may strive for camaraderie and however much one may eschew authoritarianism. The general assumption of the teaching-learning situation is that the teacher has something to offer and the student something to receive. This is true even though good teachers always learn a great deal from their students. There is no evidence to support the notion that the teacher could best perform this role as an equal participant in "bull sessions." The student may eventually reject or revise his interpretations, but the teacher has the responsibility to make a full presentation of whatever knowledge or wisdom he has to impart.

Other forces affect students' lives. Most students are emerging from adolescence and preparing themselves for future roles. Several features of our present culture make this transition to adulthood a difficult process. The length of time required to achieve

competence has lengthened progressively. Training for professional responsibility often is completed only after eight or more years of university study. This prolonged enrollment makes the student dependent on challenges within the university to build his sense of competence and identity, and there is a paucity of such situations. Learning and sustained intellectual effort seem unable in many instances to provide the necessary conditions to develop a sense of competence. Extra-academic situations frequently appear to be more urgent and relevant. Further, the student encounters difficulty in ascertaining what levels of responsibility are expected of him. Family and faculty alike frequently display an ambivalent attitude, treating him as both adolescent and adult. Finally, today's student often reaches the university with a lack of experience in the conduct of practical affairs and, more precisely, in the exercise of judgement and the assumption of responsibility.

All of these factors combine to produce a student who demands more than ever before that he have influence in university affairs. While a portion of these demands probably represent only a displacement of general frustration toward a convenient target, we nevertheless see a need for the delegation of some significant influence to students. The purposes of such shared responsibility would be: to develop the students' skills of deliberation and decision making as well as to enhance his capacity and willingness to assume responsibility; to provide the university with qualitatively better and more broadly conceived decisions; and to increase the university's sense of community derived from the effective collaboration of students, faculty and administration. The issue at Harvard is to find governance procedures that provide for sharing influence and responsibility while still preserving the needed differentiation of roles.

Administration of Justice

The provision of governance machinery for better insuring the equitable treatment of the rights and responsibilities of all University people is a clear and pressing need. Major steps have already been taken to define and clarify rights and responsibilities and to modernize the procedures for ajudicating them. These steps will need to be reviewed with deliberate care and additional provisions will need to be designed to complete the task.

Financial Issues

We can not leave this recital of the more salient issues facing Harvard governance without reference to finances. Our Committee's work has made us acutely aware of the financial constraints facing private universities. Costs are rising, traditional sources of private support are not easy to sustain, and the form and nature of governmental support are under severe attack. Surely, the prospect seems grim. Society is shortening the financial leash it holds on institutions of higher learning. New methods of adding to Harvard's resources should be developed. Perhaps the University as a whole can seek funds for discretionary allocation in addition to funds customarily raised by the several schools for their own use.

Yet Harvard's financial condition is not as alarming as that of many other universities. Because of the generosity of Harvard's friends and its conservative financial policies, it can, by exercising general restraint, engage in innovative educational programs of its own selection. Educational investments, like any others, involve risks – but can not the wisdom be marshalled to choose those that will in the future attract fresh sources of support because they truly will be building a stronger and more useful Harvard? Certainly, unless the University in the years ahead is willing to be innovative, it is likely to receive a lower level of support from alumni, foundations, and government. The times move fast and society increasingly will expect universities to experiment in ways that are likely to enrich and humanize our lives. An institution that fails to get on the cutting edge of such innovation, in a misguided attempt to play it safe, is not likely to obtain the level of resources that the future will require.

Centralized and Decentralized Decision Making

As a final issue the University will need to consider afresh the degree to which the entire governance process is centralized or decentralized. In recent decades Harvard governance has given the various parts of the University a relatively high degree of autonomy. This provision for local initiatives has been one of the important sources of Harvard's strength. Today in this regard the University faces two emerging trends that pull it in opposite directions. On the one hand is the growing diversity of values and actions vigorously proposed by participants in University

affairs. This point needs no documentation. This trend would normally push the University toward greater decentralization of its decision-making process – not only to let every tub stand on its own bottom, but also every bucket and tin – so that all the diverse views and values can be expressed without vetoes from on high. On the other hand the University as a corporate entity is under growing pressure to play a more active role in current affairs. This pressure comes not only from within the University community, but also from governmental agencies and foundations which, by their implicit actions, are favoring an official University involvement in such matters as managing large-scale research within the University. But more importantly, we have seen in our review above of the new issues facing Harvard governance that a number of them are University-wide matters that can not be addressed on a piecemeal basis. These facts are creating a press for strengthening the central decision-making capacities of Harvard.

The simultaneous existence of these contrary pressures generate a dilemma that can not be wished away. University governance procedures must be developed with awareness of both these forces. Harvard's statutes have long provided for a University-wide forum, the University Council, but Harvard's growth in size has made its specific procedures utterly impractical. There is a present need to review the case for a redesigned University senate. The domain of any such central group would need to be limited to an explicit set of issues with all others reserved for decentralized treatment. Perhaps some means can be devised for democratic control of access to the agenda of such a body with procedures spelled out for testing the interest in the proposed item and its suitability for centralized action. Beyond this, the central administration will want to redouble its efforts to act as a catalyst to induce an increasing array of collaborative ventures between the various schools and programs. With imaginative leadership and proper safeguards, we are confident that University-wide issues can be creatively addressed without diminishing the influence and initiative of the several schools.

Conclusion

The issues we have highlighted all have important implications for the review of governance procedures at Harvard. We are

convinced that significant changes are needed. Harvard, along with other universities, finds itself in the midst of the larger tensions of our changing and troubled times. With a renewed sense of the values and purposes of the University, we can approach the difficult task of changing our governance structure more fully to cope with the multiple challenges. We must regain the confidence and respect of both the young and the old. Other reports from the Committee on Governance will, in due course, recommend specific changes in Harvard's structure and procedures. If such approaches are to achieve their purpose of helping Harvard provide leadership in this crisis period, they must be accompanied by a searching debate that engages the entire community in a confrontation of new issues and basic questions. Only by such a process will it be possible to infuse new structures with life and achieve "calm rising through change and through storm."